

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,443	10/27/2000	Sherif Safwat	2146	8623
7:	590 02/13/2002		`	
Donald E Schreiber			EXAMINER	
Donald E Schreiber A Professional Corporation Post Office Box 64150 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-4150			ROWAN, KURT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	
			DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002	DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.

Office Action Summary

09/674,443

Applicant(s)

Examiner

KURT ROWAN

Art Unit

SAFWAT

3643



•				
****	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
A SHO THE N - Exten aft - If the be - If NO co - Failur	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days considered timely. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed		
Status 1) 🗌	Personaive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) ☐ 3) ☐		except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
	tion of Claims			
		is/are pending in the application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-47</u>	is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
9) □ 10) □	The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are The proposed drawing correction filed on The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.		
13) ☐ a) ☐	application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	re been received. re been received in Application No ocuments have been received in this National Stage au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). e certified copies not received.		
14) 🗆	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
Attachm	cent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
17) 🔲 to	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20} Other:		

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 12, 24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richard.

The patent to Richard shows a fishhook having an electrically conductive shank 8 having an eye (not labeled) adapted to be coupled to a fishing line. Richard shows an electrically conductive bend, a point and a self-contained bioelectric simulating means which is the interaction between anodic area of steel 4, a plastic band 7, and the gold coating 8.

4. Claims 17-21, 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodgers.

Art Unit: 3643

The patent to Rodgers shows a bioelectric simulating fishing lure having a body and electrically conductive strands 11, 13 which have sections secured to the body and other sections that protrude from the body as shown in Fig. 1. The strands are treated to provide the biosimulating means which upon immersion in water an electromagnetic field is produced about the lure to induce a strike from a fish as disclosed in column 2, lines 46-52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 4-11, 16, 25, 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barfield.

The patent to Richard shows a fishhook as discussed above. The patent to Barfield shows a fishing lure having an artificial lure A' located on the fishhook as shown in Fig. 7. In reference to claims 4-5, it would have been obvious to provide Richard with an artificial lure mounted on the

Art Unit: 3643

fishhook for the purpose of attracting more fish to the lure and inducing those to strike the lure which increases the number of fish caught.

6. Claims 22-23, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Massie.

The patent to Massie shows a fishing lure having a plurality of strands 6, 7, one of the strands is considered as the anodic segment and the other of the strands is considered as the cathodic segment. Massie has the strands separated and an electronic current flows between the fluttering electrodes which inherently produces an electromagnetic field. In reference to claim 22, Massie shows separate strands but it would have been obvious to employ the anodic and cathodic segments on the same strand since the function is the same and no stated problem is solved.

7. Claims 13-15, 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard.

The patent to Richard shows a fishing hook as discussed above. Richard does not disclose that the material forming the enlarged portion adjacent the eye (compared to the bend 4 in Fig. 1c) is heavier than the material of the shank, but it would have been obvious to employ heavier material at the enlarged portion of the hook to alter the balance of the hook depending on fishing conditions, the type of lure action being sought, and whether a trailer is mounted to the hook. In reference to claim 14, Richard shows one bend and one point, but it would have been obvious to employ a double hook (which would have a pair of bends) for the purpose of increasing the chance of hooking the fish. In reference to claim 40, Richard shows all of the elements recited

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/674,443

Art Unit: 3643

with the exception of the extension hardware coupled to the eye. However, it would have been obvious to employ old and well extension hardware to space the hook from the fish line. The examiner takes Official Notice that double hooks along with a pair of bends and extension hardware are old and well known in the art.

8. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers.

The patent to Rodgers shows a fishing lure as discussed above. Rodgers does not disclose replacing the fishhook to change cathodic segments, but it would have been obvious to change the fishhook to change cathodic segments instead of replacing segments 11, 13 since the function is the same and no stated problem is solved.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Ho et al., Hawley, Linder, Gentry et al., and Anderson show other fishhooks and fishing lures with electric elements.

10.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KURT ROWAN whose telephone number is (703) 308-2321.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 3643

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is $(703)\ 306-4195$ or $(703)\ 305-3597$.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

KURT ROWAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 3643

February 6, 2002